

GIUSEPPE SAVOCA, *Il canzoniere di Petrarca tra codicologia ed ecdotica*. (Polinnia, 20.)
Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2008. Paper. Pp. vii, 331 plus 16 black-and-white and color
plates; many black-and-white and color figures and tables. €38.
doi:10.1017/S0038713411003721

This volume is a companion text to the author's critical edition of the *Canzoniere* (also 2008) and seeks to present Petrarch in a light that is both more ancient and more modern than is customary. This goal is accomplished by a reexamination of Vatican Library, Vat. Lat. 3195 (or *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*, known as the *Canzoniere*), that blends the insights of ecdotics (the practices that govern the preparation of critical editions) and codicology (the study of manuscript books in their material and cultural individuality). Savoca is an adept practitioner of both disciplines in the digital era. In this study he brings to our attention the original manuscript in all its detail: its binding, its makeup in terms of the size and number of the *fascicoli*, or signatures, the handwriting of the scribes (Giovanni Malpaghini and Petrarch, but also a third person responsible for the list of first lines), the markings and notes of other hands on the manuscript, the inks, the graphic disposition of poems on the page (including the illuminated letters), the additions and erasures, marginal numbering of the poems, holes, and, in a painstaking analysis, the punctuation and "metrical-rhythmic" signs. Here and throughout the volume one has detailed photographic documentation to accompany the analytical description.

Savoca examines the seventy-two sheets of Vat. Lat. 3195 (fols. 1–49 forming part 1; fols. 53–72, part 2), noting that Malpaghini drafted poems 1–190 and 264–318, with Petrarch doing the rest. The graphic proportions of the pages and of the "window" of the text on the page follow the Pythagorean rectangle, a harmony that reinforces the "self-similarity" of the text. As concerns the two-part division of the work, the author discusses how editors have labeled these "in vita" and "in morte di Madonna Laura" and have altered the original, starting part 2 with poem 267 instead of 264. A typical page contains thirty-two available spaces for lines; since two lines are written as one across the page (except for sestinas, where only one line is written), the page can contain four sonnets with regular spacing. Savoca's analysis extends to each of the lyric genres: how they are distinguished and how they cohere into a single architecture. Of great importance are the prosodic signs adopted by Petrarch, as distinct from punctuation; citing over two hun-

dred examples, Savoca rejects the inferences of editors that these “rhythmic accents” amount to punctuation. He also comments on incidental markings, such as offprinting blotches, that lead him to alter the diffused readings of *Fragmenta* 179, line 9, and 228, line 5.

The author’s discussion of the “forms” and “editions” of the *Canzoniere* follows its transcription *in ordine* in Vat. Lat. 3196, the codex of the “Abbozzi.” While not intended as such, that codex serves as an invaluable record of compilations and transcriptions. Here one finds the first explicit note regarding a *canzoniere*, dated November 1357 (though Savoca suggests it is likely that an ordered sequence was under way by 1342). Taking issue with Ernest Hatch Wilkins’s determination of many forms, Savoca states that there are only three forms containing partial versions of the definitive edition: the Chigi form, being the first true edition of Petrarch’s *Fragmentorum liber*; the Malatesta form; and the Queriniana form. He rejects arguments that Vat. Lat. 3195 is only a working copy, arguing on the basis of paleographic and philological evidence that “il libro del Canzoniere si presenta rigorosamente compiuto e definito, tanto sul piano della scrittura e della lezione dei singoli testi quanto su quello dell’architettura e della organicità narrativa dell’insieme” (p. 95).

The Malatesta and Queriniana forms were both transcribed after Petrarch’s death; the former contains many linguistic inaccuracies and “northernisms” while the latter is more correct and is the closest codex to Vat. Lat. 3195. The history of printed editions is distinguished by Aldo Manuzio’s edition of 1501, which became the old “vulgate.” In the modern era, after Giacomo Leopardi’s 1826 edition, one has the editions of Giovanni Mestica (1896) and Giuseppe Salvo Cozzo (1904); the only diplomatic edition was published by the Modigliani press (1904), which was the source text for Gianfranco Contini and was in turn relied on by later editors. Savoca corrects numerous errors of capitalization and punctuation in the Modigliani edition; besides his own edition and Modigliani’s, Savoca argues, only two others—by the Valdezoco press (1472) and Salvo Cozzo—have derived from direct contact with the original. Thus it is not surprising that the ecdotic history of the *Canzoniere* is riddled with errors.

Summarizing his conclusions about Petrarch’s punctuation practices, Savoca contrasts his own edition with the digital *Canzoniere* published by Nicola Zingarelli (based on Contini), or the “contemporary vulgate.” By removing commas, semicolons, colons, and exclamation marks that editors had added over the centuries, Savoca restores to the *Fragmenta* the full weight of the period (“punto”): “Ne risulta un testo graficamente più pulito, meglio articolato nella struttura sintattica e pervaso da una ‘musica’ nuova, più scandita e a volte più nervosa a quasi ‘sincopata’, mai però frammentata e disorganica. Riportare il punto al ruolo grafico che gli compete significa anche difenderne ‘il suo significato interno nella scrittura’ (Kandinsky) . . .” (p. 169).

Also with respect to capital letters and spelling, Savoca enumerates errors that have long been accepted as authoritative. He notes that in his edition he has followed Petrarch’s practice of capitalizing each line of verse; he has added capitals where the “vulgate” has lowercase, usually because of the replacement of a semicolon with a period; and he has eliminated nearly four hundred capital letters that editors had used for emphasis (half of them in *Amor/Amore*). Savoca compiles a list of 212 differences between the “vulgate” and his edition. The main difference he highlights is syntactic, a fact born out of the radically changed punctuation; this change begets a change in intonation and music, making the text freer and more energetic.

Since Petrarch employed no accents or apostrophes, the letter *a* understood as a word can have five different meanings (as preposition and/or verb, with or without implied definite article). This fact is at the heart of one of the appendixes, “Recupero di quattro ‘A’ nei *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*,” which corrects four “simple” examples of a more widespread phenomenon.

Another appendix, “L’ira’ di Petrarca fra ermeneutica e concordanze,” places in relief an Ajax-like persona (as one of the various personae expressed by Petrarch’s “io lirico”) by building on the prominence of the theme of anger in sonnet 232 and relating it to the suicide theme in poems 36 and 268; the crowning achievement of this appendix is the corrective gloss given to *Fragmenta* 29, line 13.

The appendix “Letture filologiche del *Canzoniere* nel Novecento” summarizes the merits and failings of the editions of Salvo Cozzo, Mestica, Giosue Carducci and Severino Ferrari, Ezio Chiòrboli, Contini, Marco Santagata, and Rosanna Bettarini, especially as regards the cruxes in the text. Here Savoca provides a welcome thematic discussion that views the actuality of Petrarch in a philosophical and existential key. He dramatizes the role of the reader in completing Petrarch’s text and stresses the text’s orality. The cautionary message is well supported by Savoca’s scientific method and cogent argumentation: as long as the text is respected, interpretations of it can vary freely; but when pretextual interpretation of the text causes an editor to overlook the original, then problems will arise.

THOMAS E. PETERSON, University of Georgia